DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 501 UD 019 598

AUTHOR	Grannis, Joseph C.
TITLE	Classroom Culture and the Problem of Control. ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series, Number 63.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 79
CONTRACT	400-77-0071
NOTE	45p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Alternative Schools; Attendance; *Classroom Environment; Disadvantaged Youth; *Discipline; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Literacy; Minority Group Children; Open Education; *Student Behavior; Student Teacher Ratio; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; Traditional Schools

ABSTRACT

Although classrooms vary in design and populations, there are certain features that are common to virtually all classrooms. These include the crowding of pupils, the compulsion of school attendance, and the expectation that teachers will foster literacy. The manner in which these features are dealt with in a classroom constitutes the core problem of control in schooling. The most common solution to the problem of control is the standard classroom. Alternative classroom settings that appear to be associated with differences among children can best be understood as variations on the standard classroom. In some of these alternatives, higher support conditions and the positive cast of classroom activities seem to reduce the disorder and alienation found in classrooms, particularly with regard to disadvantaged and ethnic minority children. However, as a number of studies suggest, differences stemming from the students' and teachers' styles within a classroom are more prominent than differences between standard and alternative educational settings. These findings indicate that the most significant changes in classrooms would only be possible if the basic conditions of schooling were so altered that the standard classroom simply would not work. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173501

ERIC/CUE URBAN DIVERSITY SERIES

Number 63, May 1979

CLASSROOM CULTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF CONTROL

Joseph C. Grannis

Teachers College, Columbia University

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION

Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

UD019598

This publication is one in the ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education under Contract 400-77-0071 between the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Teachers College, Columbia University. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinion of the National Institute of Education.

Additional copies will be available from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210

Its ED identification number and full ordering instructions will be found in Resources in Education, the monthly ERIC abstract journal, or can be obtained by contacting ERIC/CUE.

CLASSROOM CULTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF CONTROL

Joseph C. Grannis

School classrooms everywhere are different and the same. The tendency of educators and citizens to project their visions of a better life on the schools has, along with modern technology, contributed to a proliferation of designs for classrooms. We can point to classrooms that purport to be open or closed, nongraded or graded, oriented to individuals, groups or a class as a whole, and concerned more with basics or with enrichment--and for each of these and their combinations find a political and technical rationale. Classrooms vary also in their populations, as teachers or pupils are of one or another gender, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and aptitude. For these reasons one might expect strong differences between the cultures of various classrooms.

We observe also, however, that virtually all classrooms have in common certain features. Formally, these features include an expectation that teachers will inculcate in their pupils certain knowledge, skills, and standards of conduct; the daily, seasonal, and life-span time frame within which schooling is conducted; and the high ratio of pupils to teachers--"high", that is, compared with the proportion of children or youths to adults that is found in most settings outside schools. Informally, classrooms are characterized by behavior patterns that include responses to these conditions--responses which, in the eyes of many observers, are more similar than dissimilar.

A version of this paper will appear as a chapter in the 1980 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, edited by Wells Foshay.

The formal conditions of schooling generate what we can call the problem of control in classrooms. Indeed, turning things around somewhat, we must ask if classrooms are not themselves an adaptation to the problem of control in schooling. The core of the culture of a classroom is a teacher's and the pupils' responses to the problem of control. This will be our central argument. We shall begin by characterizing a "standard" classroom culture and examining the sources of the general problem of control. Later the chapter will turn to variations on this pattern to explore the significance of differences among pupils and between alternative designs for the classroom. Ultimately, one must ask how the problem of control in classrooms relates to problems of control in society at large. However, those analyses--of which there are many now--that immediately leap to the socializing and sorting functions of schooling overlook the immediate origins of the problem of control in the peculiar ecology of schools themselves.

The sameness of classrooms

The point to be made first is not simply that all classrooms are alike, but that there is a standard classroom situation that is very difficult to alter. In the late 1960's Goodlad and Klein conducted observations in 150 classrooms, ranging from kindergarten through third grade, and about equally distributed between large and small proportions of disadvantaged children. About half of the sample schools were involved as single schools or as part of their districts in projects or activities supported by supplementary funds from local, state, federal, or private sources. The time, it will be recalled, stood toward the end of a decade and a half of rationalist school reform: team teaching and nongraded instruction, for which Goodlad had been one of the most outspoken

proponents, and numerous national curriculum projects, including a variety at the elementary school level. Goodlad and Klein found a general pattern which is most sharply conveyed by the physical image of the classrooms they observed:

> In regard to seating, the kindergarten rooms almost always provided some kind of table-and-chair arrangement, a pattern that faded until individual desks in rooms became equally uniform for the third grade. Similarly, the rug corners and reading circles of the first two years had virtually disappeared by the third and fourth.
>
> The general picture is that of a play-like environment of the kindergarten, with considerable opportunity for freedom of movement and activity, giving way to a much more restricted and circumscribed academic environment thereafter. By the third grade, materials and seating arrangements suggest a passive, immobile pattern characterized by seatwork and total group activity under teacher direction. (Goodlad and Klein, 1970, p.63)

Overall, reading in groups was the most frequent activity observed. Second most frequent was "independent activities", which shifted from physical movement, especially manipulation of objects, toward academic work, between kindergarten and third grade. Arithmetic, language arts other than reading (writing, spelling, listening to stories, etc.), singing and music, and physical education made up the remainder of the activities that, together, constituted more than 85 percent of the classroom events observed. Goodlad and Klein did find variations in this pattern between the "regular" and the predominantly disadvantaged classes. Disadvantaged children spent proportionally more time than advantaged children in reading in first grade, but less time in reading in third grade. The disadvantaged third grade children also spent less time in singing and music, physical education, and independent work of a relatively creative sort or at least selected by the children from a set of options. They spent correspondingly more time in prescribed seatwork, in

workbooks and so forth, which Goodlad and Klein characterize as "busy work".* Finally, the proportions of time spent in arithmetic were comparable for the different classes throughout the grades. These findings foreshadow those of other research that we will attend to later in the chapter. However, Goodlad and Klein end up giving greatest emphasis to the similarities between classes:

> One conclusion stands out clearly: many of the changes we have believed to be taking place in schooling have not been getting into classrooms; changes widely recommended for the schools over the past 15 years were blunted on school and classroom door. Second, schools and classrooms were marked by a sameness regardless of location, student enrollment, and "typing" as provided initially to us by an administrator.
>
> Third, there seemed to be a considerable discrepancy between teachers' perceptions of their own innovative behavior and the perceptions of observers. The teachers sincerely thought they were individualizing instruction, encouraging inductive learning, involving children in group processes, and so on. Fourth, "special", supplementary, and enrichment activities and practices differed very little from "regular" classroom activities. Fifth, general or specific classroom goals were not identifiable to observers. Instruction was general in character and not specifically directed to diagnosed needs, progress, and problems of individual children. Teachers shot with a shotgun, not a rifle. Sixth, the direction being pursued by the school as a whole was equally obscure or diffused.
>
> Seventh, there appeared not to be a critical mass of teachers, parents, and others working together toward developing either a sense of direction or solutions to school-wide problems concerning them. Eight parallels number seven: school personnel appeared to be very much alone in their endeavors. Principals tended to remain in offices and hallways and not to intrude on sacred classroom ground in any direct way. Teachers, although alone and presumably free to teach in their classrooms, appeared to be bound to a common conception of what school is and should be. (Goodlad and Klein, 1970, pp. 97-98)

---

*Personal communication from the authors. The increase in seatwork is implied but not explicated in Behind the Classroom Door.

The highly teacher dominated verbal interactions Goodlad and Klein observed "behind the classroom door" are very consistent with those observed a decade before by Hughes (1959) in a sample of 41 both recommended and randomly selected elementary school classrooms. The more general behavior patterns are consistent with various observations in elementary school classrooms, ranging from Jackson's dispassionate Life in Classrooms (1968) to Holt's polemical How Children Fail (1964).

At the junior and senior high school level, a similar variety of studies attest to the sameness of classrooms. The Report of the National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education (Martin, 1975), to which a group of widely experienced and distinguished educators contributed, concluded that the organization of high schools around the classroom unit has tended to render them "inflexible in their adaptive capacity to encompass newer instructional forms and procedures." As these newer forms and procedures--at the high school level these include team teaching, the use of paraprofessionals, flexible scheduling, modules, minischools, and various inductive and experiential approaches to learning--have been meant to break the mold of the classroom unit, and in a limited number of cases have done so, it appears that classroom organization has tended to resist these changes.

Inside the standard high school classroom, most of what takes place overtly is talk; most of the talk is by the teacher; the typical pattern of talk is teacher question/student answer/teacher reaction followed by teacher question; the questions generally ask for recall or extrapolation of knowledge, making minimal demands on students' critical, creative, or empathic capacities; and such capacities of this sort that the students do have are manifested more in their myriad ways of refining the classroom game.

Quotations from two first-hand accounts of life in secondary schools will illustrate these claims. Cusick participated in the student life of a comprehensive school that drew lower-to-middle class students from small towns and rural and suburban areas. One of the observations that sets the stage of his book is the following:

> Exceptions do occur, especially in classes where the students are divided into work units and carry out some prearranged experiment or project in cooperation with one another. There the teacher carries on his instruction by walking around, interacting with them encouraging one group at a time. But these are classes such as physics or chemistry labs where the lab manuals and texts lay out the step by step process to be followed, and there too the methods are structured and the answers set. It is not enough just to say simply that there were good and bad classes, good and bad teachers. The fact was that the teaching in all classes, science, math, English, language, was remarkably similar. The teacher would take care of his basic maintenance activity: take attendance, close the door, accept late slips, take out his book, and call the page number; then he would structure the activity by acting out the part of questioner, encourager, teller, and explicator, doing, of course, most of what there was to do while the students watched, waited, and responded to his cues. This was the way classes were conducted day in and day out. (Cusick, 1973, p.28)

Herndon taught in an inner-city junior high school, "about 98 percent Negro, they had told me downtown in the district office, as if to say not entirely Negro."

> What did I want them to do? I wanted them to learn something about English, since that was what they were spozed to learn in my class, and specifically I wanted them to learn something about writing--how to say what they wanted on paper so that somebody else could read it. But that brought us back to what they wanted to say, or anyway what they wanted to say on paper. That ought to be written down instead of just talked about. In this respect the discussions, upon which I'd counted, were a failure; no one found it necessary to record his own or anyone else's thoughts.
>
> The problem with 9D was to find out what they wanted done which needed the classroom, the school situation to do, which couldn't be done otherwise. (Herndon, 1965, p.100)

Herndon was absent for a month. When he returned,

> 9D...greeted me with an indignant and sincere-sounding outcry. Mrs. A was a better teacher than I, she was a real teacher, I wasn't no real teacher, she really made them work, not just have them old discussions every day; no, man, they were learning spelling and sentences and all they was spozed to. Moreover she was strict and didn't allow fooling around--all in all they felt they'd been really getting somewhere I looked in my grade book, up to now pretty empty of marks, and saw, sure enough, a whole string of grades after each name--mostly, however, F's and zeroes. Many of them had nothing but zeroes, which I took to mean they had been busy not-doing this important work. I pointed this out to the class, but it didn't matter. They had been back on familiar ground; strict teacher, no fooling around, no smart-off, no discussions about how bad school was, and plenty of work. That was, after all, what school was and they were in favor of it. (Ibid., p.102)

The problem of control as discipline

What school "is" underlies all of these observations, which brings us back to the problem of control. On the surface, the problem of control is "the discipline problem". Numberous studies have found this to be among the most salient problems teachers themselves perceive. Waller (1932), using anecdotes collected from his students, interpreted life in the high school classroom as a constant struggle for control. Loss of control over their classes and loss of their jobs were the two things teachers feared most. The problem of control underlay even those classrooms in which the rows of children appeared to be the most orderly. The pupils could erupt at any moment, exploiting any weakness of the teacher. They might take off on a saying or gesture of the teacher, might destroy a rule by literalizing it, might introduce extraneous matter to disturb a discussion, and so on. The teachers who controlled their classes most successfully commanded without explanation, used punishment to define the situation of the student, manipulated pupils' social relationships, expressed anger quickly and maintained it until

a crisis had passed, and appealed to the most relevant ideals and motives of their pupils.

Waller's account would apply to many classrooms today, though one might characterize others in more subtle terms. Most enduring are the dynamics of control that Waller analyzed: the "perilous equilibrium" of social order in the school, the social distance between teacher and pupil, the need for the teacher not to compromise this distance in the eyes of other teachers, and the roles pupils play in the classroom--clown, bully, goat, good boy, bad boy, teacher's helper and so on--some of them roles developed in the children's primary groups, and others roles that are more unique to the classroom.

Smith and Geoffrey some thirty-five years later, analyzed an urban eighth grade classroom in terms that are remarkably consistent with Waller's dynamics, especially considering that the conceptual framework of their analysis was painstakingly built by applying to their observations theoretical sources that were far removed from Waller, the spare and elegant sociological concepts of Homans. Smith and Geoffrey add to Waller a time perspective derived from their having observed with Geoffrey as the teacher for a year in a single classroom. Thus one sees in their account not only individual student roles--the court jester, the nonworker--but an intricate process of interweaving the children's and the teacher's expectations as certain behavior sequences spiral to form the individual-in-the role. Defining "classroom control" as "the relationship between teacher direction, usually verbal, and a high probability of pupil compliance" (Smith and Geoffrey, 1968, p.67), the authors identified four stages of the teacher's establishing initial control. "Grooving the children" involved the teacher's stating the rules and commanding activities--

without much explanation, but with enough warmth, humor, and pleasure in the activities themselves, to infuse the classroom "belief" systems with "sentiments" to form classroom "norms". "I mean it," "following through," and "softening the tone of classroom management" characterized the subsequent stages of establishing control.

As Waller emphasized, and recent studies have reaffirmed, it is not only the teacher who establishes control. A new teacher especially is socialized to the role of disciplinarian by other teachers and by the pupils themselves. McPherson (1972) identified four major strands of the self-image of the teachers in a school in which she herself taught: disciplinarian, director of learning, industrious worker, and one deserving just and equitable treatment.

> The most clearly observable aspect of a teacher was her success or failure as a preserver of discipline.
> "Successful teachers do not have problems."
> "To have to send a child to the principal is to 'admit that you can't control the kids.'"
> So it was in the area of discipline that the standards of role performance were clearest and that the attempts at social control by older over younger and newer teachers were most evident. (McPherson, 1972, p.31)

Fuller summarized as follows the data reported in six studies that examined beginning teachers' problems without severely restricting the alternatives among which the teachers could choose:

> As it is reported by these investigations, what we know is that beginning teachers are concerned about class control, about their own content adequacy, about the situations in which they teach and about evaluations by their supervisors, by their pupils and of their pupils by themselves.
>
> The consistency of these findings is remarkable in the light of the different populations surveyed. The consistency lies not only in the similarity of concerns expressed but in the absence of concern about topics which are usually included in education courses: instructional design, methods of presenting subject matter, assessment of pupil learning, dynamics of child behavior and so on. (Fuller, 1969, p.10)

On the basis of a range of studies, Fuller argued persuasively for a developmental conceptualization of teachers' concerns, from a pre-teaching phase that is quite vague about the classroom to an early teaching phase of concern with self, as characterized above, to, finally, a phase of late concerns focused on pupil gain and self evaluation as opposed to personal gain and evaluation by others. Fuller observed that a teacher could get "stuck" in the second of her three phases. From a more sociological and ecological perspective, we might hypothesize that the basic conditions of schooling that constitute the problem of control ensnare most teachers in Fuller's initial teaching phase.

Lortie (1975) discusses teachers' opinions, documented in other studies and confirmed by his own surveys, that education courses had not adequately prepared them to deal with the problems of classroom discipline and management, the courses being too "idealistic" and "out of touch with reality". Teachers learn to take the role of teacher largely through the 13,000 hours they spend in classrooms, on the average, before graduation, and then through their experience as teachers themselves. Teachers-to-be underestimate the difficulties of the role, but still there is not much shift in their conceptualization of it after entry to the role. Lortie takes this to be evidence of the limited influence other teachers have on a given teacher's idea of how to implement the role, though the pressure to maintain control is strong from other teachers.

On the theme of the sameness of classrooms, Lortie surmises that the classroom unit is maintained, with low interdependence of classrooms, because of the high turnover rate of teachers and the greater ease of adapting classroom units to local population changes. In our own view, the moral difficulties of rationalizing the teaching role contribute to

the persistence of the autonomous classroom. About half the teachers interviewed in one of Lortie's surveys "emphasized moral outcomes that would result from their work".

> Teachers are charged with maintaining good order and discipline in their classrooms. It is highly probable, in my view, that elaborations along moral lines, in addition to demonstrating continuities within teaching, give additional meaning to these disciplinary activities. (Lortie, 1975, pp. 112-113)

The possibility of interpreting the conditions of schooling in a way congruent with one's own moral principles may be greatest in one's "own" classroom, whatever stage of development, in Fuller's terms, a teacher is at. The autonomy of the classroom also protects the teacher from being observed in moral compromises, be they screaming, favoring compliant children, or more subtle departures from an ideal. The mystique of teaching, the feeling of many that the problem of control defies pedagogy, the sacrosanctum of the classroom, seems to emanate from this personal moral factor.

The problem of control and the conditions of schooling

We alluded at the outset to three basic conditions of schooling, the expectation that teachers will accomplish learning in their pupils, the time frame of schooling, and the high ratio of pupils to teachers. We turn to these now to ask why discipline should be such a problem in the school, and what further ramifications control has in the culture of classrooms. Waller (1932) anticipated much of what we understand today from a sociological point of view, while Jackson (1968) presents the most complete ecological analysis. Smith and Goeffrey (1968) combine these perspectives. We shall take up the three basic conditions of schooling in the reverse order of their statement above.

1. The ratio of children to adults. A far larger number of children or youths--simply in the aggregate, and in proportion to adults--is present in classrooms and schools than in any setting of everyday life outside of school (or church school), except certain recreation settings. Jackson explores the implications of this crowding in detail. He attributes to it teachers' determining who will and will not speak, allocating supplies, granting special privileges, and serving as official timekeeper. The necessity of waiting, the denial of desire as, for example, only some can answer a question or be granted a request and the frequency of interruptions, are shown to be further consequences of the crowding of children in classrooms.

Most poignant of all is what Jackson summarizes as the requirement that children be "alone in the crowd", ignoring the potential distractions of peers with whom they are more intimately associated than they are likely to be, again in such numbers, in settings outside of school. This last point is particularly crucial, in that it especially seems to arise out of the circumstances of the school situation itself, rather than obviously serving some socializing function for future life.

A further implication can be drawn, the underside of the points that Jackson has made. The crowding of children in classrooms makes it difficult for them to exercise the peer competencies, the skills of regulating their relationships to one another, that the children are already developing in settings outside the school. Younger children playing in unsupervised settings rarely interact in groups exceeding three or four individuals. Where larger numbers of young children (still rarely as large as in school) are coordinated, they tend to be organized by adults or by older youths in a game, a party, or an adventure. In

any case, the activities are almost invariably related to physical things, the toys and found objects, spaces, and surfaces of children's play. Things mediate children's relationships to one another. This is the social order that kindergarten recognizes. It is thus quite understandable that young children might be "unruly" when they are congregated in large numbers and expected to orient almost exclusively to language encoded information, spoken or written. The children's already learned rules for regulating their interactions do not apply, and in fact they will resort to these rules--forming spontaneous groups and making play objects of whatever comes to hand--whenever the pressure to attend to exclusively language encoded information is relaxed. "Socializing" young children to the standard classroom is thus not just a matter of teaching them the expected conduct once-and-for-all, but one of continual vigilance to maintain it.

As children grow older, the patterns of their interaction change, but the end result remains problematic for a classroom. The children's friendship bonds strengthen, not to the same degree for every child, but in networks wherein increasingly stable clusters of children are directly or indirectly connected to certain individuals who emerge as the centers of attraction--though some children (Gronland (1959) estimated 11 to 22 percent of the children in all classes at all grade levels) are persistently excluded. Outside the classroom, in the extracurricular activities of schools and in the settings of the children's/youth's non-school recreation--streets and fields, fast food establishments, car parks, community dance centers, parties, and so on--the children interact, or watch the action, in increasingly larger numbers with minimum adult organization or surveillance, if any at all. The largest interactions,

for example sports contests and dances, continue to be organized around things, but language emerges as a sufficient medium for many social activities. Some interpretations of "adolescent society" argue that youths are exercising capacities for leading and following, for self assertion and affiliation, that will be prized when they are adults (Coleman, 1961; cf.Henry, 1965). Youths eagerly take what part-time work is available to them, and in recent years some have been active in political causes--desegregation, antiwar activity, and ecology. One of every ten girls today becomes pregnant before age 17, and an increasing number of adolescents formally marry while still in high school. However, the limited opportunities for youths to participate in the economy and political system, linked with the continuance of most in their childhood homes past the point when they are biologically capable of forming separate families, results in their capacities being, to say the least, out of phase with what adult society is prepared to accomodate.

It is the crowding of these youths into the secondary school that the Martin Report (op. cit.) emphasizes. The report argues that the sheer logistics of maintaining custody of youths in school for six or more hours a day, not just in classes, but in study halls, libraries, cafeterias, hallways, and so on, disperses the teachers allotted to a school in such a way that the average class has to be large. Of course, one must ask <u>why</u> a certain proportion of teachers to students, resulting in a relatively constant range of class sizes, has been allotted to schools in modern times. What society is willing to pay for teachers certainly figures in this somehow. Society's valuation of teachers, however, is based in part on some estimate of how many teachers it requires to do the work of schooling. It might not be too outrageous to

suppose that 20 to 40 students represents the comfortable and barely tolerable extremes to which a teacher's voice and vision can be adapted from the front of the room. In ways that we shall explore further below, the standard pupil-teacher ratio might thus tend to perpetuate the traditional modes of teaching with which it is consistent. Be this as it may, adolescents are bound to test themselves, to express their interests in one another, to pull out now one and now another stop in the exquisitely elaborated instruments of their social expression, in the most ordinary converse of the classroom. For the adolescent, perhaps even more than for the younger child, a classroom is a potential forum. For the teacher of adolescents, as of younger children, it is necessary either to employ their social competencies or to repress them.

ii. The time frame of schooling

The fact that children are required to attend school for certain days and hours between the ages of six and sixteen clearly relates to the youths we have just been discussing, as part and parcel of their exclusion from adult society. Stinchcombe (1969) has demonstrated that those youths for whom the connection between schooling and subsequent employment is most tenuous are the most alienated from high school, particularly lower class males. Drop-out statistics tell the same story. At the same time, exclusion affects all students in ways that the drop-out statistics do not begin to estimate.

What more general effect on school experience does the requirement to attend school have? Jackson (1968) reviewed a variety of earlier and more recent studies of both younger and older children's feelings about school. These studies showed relatively small proportions of students with strong feelings of like or dislike after the earliest years of school. Most students' feelings toward school could be characterized as stereotyped

acceptance or indifference. A provocative finding in two studies, however, was that students who indicated a liking for school most often selected negative adjectives from a checklist to describe their typical classroom feelings. Contrary to conventional school wisdom, the studies contain no evidence for a correlation between students' academic success and their liking of school. Jackson relates all of this to school's becoming "old hat", holding few surprises "after the first few thousand hours of attendance" (!). Jackson points also to the fact that children must attend school whether they want to or not. To us this latter fact has the prior significance, linking first of all to the physical quality of school life, its peculiar mixture of passivity and many things happening that Jackson describes so effectively. School attendance is prescribed legally in terms of days and hours of a span of years. The law affects most directly the distribution of children's activity in time. School starts and ends at prescribed hours of the day. The tempo of activity from minute to minute speeds up and slows down in a regular rhythm punctuated by arrival, snacks or recess, luncheon, the brief breaks at class or activity changing time, and the approach of a day's, a week's, and a season's end. It is lifted or depressed by less regular happenings: special assemblies, fire drills, jokes, things falling, working, failing, whatever events can occasion an outburst of appreciation or a groan of despair. Children's energies course through school like waters in a stream, moving faster or slower as the stream bed changes, and finding their way even under ice. Our analysis of crowding emphasizes the social dimension of schooling, while the knowledge required in school directs us to its intellectual aspect. The fact of compulsory school attendance focuses us on the physical dimension of the school environment. Control of a physical aspect of children's lives, their time, is the point of

departure for the law.

It remains to be said that the time frame of schooling does not entirely dictate how the children's energies are to be regulated. As the crowding of children creates the problem of control of their social propensities, children's restriction in time creates the problem of control of their activity. Teachers might attempt themselves to control children's energies entirely, or they might accomodate more to the children's own, individual and cultural, definitions of work-, play-, and rest-time.

iii. The expectation that teachers will foster literacy

The teaching of reading, writing, arithmetic, and knowledge articulated by these means--broadly speaking, the development of literacy--is very much a matter of control. First of all, just the fact that certain individuals, all of them adults, have been officially designated as "teachers" suggests that it is their knowledge which is to be definitive in the classroom. This does not simply mean that teachers' answers are correct answers. The very form in which knowledge is to be demonstrated--as answers to questions, story telling, moves in a game, or actions of a craft--is itself a definition of knowledge. Thus the form that the teacher fosters conveys knowledge about knowledge. If a teacher is pressured by environmental circumstances into the enactment of one or another form, the teacher's role sanctions this as knowledge none-the-less.

For anyone to teach reading, writing and arithmetic to any number of others would involve the exercise of control in some way. Consider simply the nature of the alphabet. In so far as its letters stand for sounds that combine to form the words of spoken language, "decoding" and "encoding" might be though to be purely rational processes. In certain respects, however, the alphabet is highly arbitrary: the shapes used to represent the sounds, the order A to Z in which the alphabet is transmitted, and, particularly in English, the inexact correspondence between the letters

and sounds as a given letter may stand for more than one sound, and a given sound can be formed from more than one combination of letters. Learning to read and write, and in partly similar ways the learning of arithmetic, thus entails accomodation to conventions as well as sheer perceptual discrimination and reasoning. What we mean by "control" in this case is linked to what Dawe (cited in Young, 1971) has called the imposition of meaning". Spelling is a blatant example of this for virtually all school children, a paradigm for more subtle disciplines of knowledge to come. For children whose spoken language is not standard English, the imposition of meaning in learning to read and write is compounded.

Reading, writing, and at least advanced arithmetic are conducted exclusively through symbols. One gets virtually no information from isolated symbols directly. Information is extracted from their connection with other symbols of their system, and whatever associations they may have with sensory experience. This distinguishes symbols from concrete things and events,which contain relatively more information within their shapes and boundaries, information that, further, yields more directly to sensory actions.

That symbols can be used to represent objects and events one has not experienced constitutes their most immediate power, and simultaneously presents a problem of access to their meaning. Progressive educators' criticism of exclusively verbal and numerical modes of conveying knowledge in classrooms concentrated on the superficiality and distortions of understanding that can result from having to employ concepts whose referents have not been directly experienced (Brownell and Hendrickson, 1950). In characterizing this as "passive" learning the progressives also anticipate

the point of view which Piaget (1970) especially has worked out, that thought must be developed through actions on concrete objects before it can be operationalized more formally. Piaget, however, leads us to the edge of a more profound level of the problem of meaning, let us say of the problem of control over meaning, one that the progressives slighted. This is the capacity of symbolically represented knowledge to form and transform experience, to arrange the objects and events symbols refer to in relationships that are not simply induced from experience.

Abstraction--the separation of properties from things and events in their contexts to define categories and relationships--is crucial to the regulations of experience in modern society. Modern science, industry, agriculture, commerce, administration, communication, and warfare (how can we leave this out?) all depend upon abstraction. That children and youths from different sectors of society have different degrees of access to this mode of thinking will be central to questions to be pursued later in this chapter. Here we can observe more simplistically that schools in our society are expected to foster abstract thought. Blum has speculated that "remoteness from everyday life...is an important element in legitimating academic knowledge in schools" (Blum, 1971, p.154). Why would this be so? The capacity of remoteness for legitimating academic knowledge derives in part from the part abstraction plays in the control of the systems of modern life. At least one intended or claimed function of academic knowledge is the transmission of this control to students.

Abstraction itself, however, is not the only source of the remoteness of academic knowledge. Another source is suggested more by the term "academic" itself. This is the fact that the disciplines of knowledge have been organized around bodies of information and conceptual frameworks

that are conventional, the knowledge compacts of the academies. These conventions, more complex than those of the alphabet, link academics to one another in a common discourse that constitutes for them a different "reality" from the reality of nonparticipants. As a "discipline" becomes a "subject" the conventions become submerged, yet they continue to control meaning nonetheless. The difference is that the learner has less access to the rules of a subject than a parent discipline, except the most primitive rule of all, which is to replicate the contents of the subject.

A final aspect of academic knowledge is somewhat paradoxical in relation to its basis in conventions. This is what Goody and Watt (1962) have delineated as the solitary and individualistic nature of writing and reading as communication. Not only is communication through writing more solitary just mechanically, compared with talk, but there is less opportunity for immediate adjustment of differences of interpretation between reader and writer than between speakers. This can cut two ways in a classroom. On the one hand, writing can be developed as a personal medium of expression, and the discussion of writing, or reading done in common can emphasize individual pupils' differences of interpretation. On the other hand, reading and writing can be used to isolate pupils from one another, however consciously or unconsciously this may happen. The process is most conspicuous in seatwork that is "busy work". It also enters into the classic pattern of teacher question/pupil answer/teacher reaction followed by teacher question, as the teacher takes the presumed standpoint of the author of a reading, especially a textbook, and monitors the pupils' interpretation of the reading. This links the nature of reading and writing to the evaluation that Jackson underscores as another pervasive

quality of classroom life. Reading and writing and their discussion evoke evaluation. They can further be employed to occasion evaluation, where the latter is central to the teacher's control of the pupils' social relationships, and in the maintenance of the teacher's authority more generally.

What all this amounts to is that by its very nature the intellectual material of schooling requires the learner's acceptance of cultural conventions at various levels of abstractness. More often than not, however, the classroom teacher does not share with students the intellectual gains and trade-offs of these conventions, but requires instead the students' submission to a more personalistic authority, the teacher's own knowledge.

Much of what we have been saying here about academic knowledge and control can be illustrated by a discussion Hughes recorded in an intermediate grade classroom.

Teacher: Incidentally, did the California Indians have a pretty easy life?

Arthur: No.

Teacher: Yes, they did, Arthur. Don't you remember? Who can tell me about it? (Hands up) Eddie.

Eddie: (Tells about Indians not having to work)

Teacher: Why didn't they have to work as hard as other Indians? Larry.

Larry: They didn't have to fight.

Teacher: They were peaceful Indians. But one fact. One word will answer it. Robert.

Robert: (Tells about freedom)

Teacher: That's right. They had freedom. Rebecca.

Rebecca: Lots of food.

Teacher: Yes, they had lots of food. Janice.

Janice: (Says more about food)

Teacher: All right, but why did they have lots of food?

Child: They had all the food they wanted.

Teacher: All right, why?

Child: (comments)

Teacher: All right, but there is still one thing I wanted you to say.

Child: (Tries to tell about raising crops) I can't think of the word.

Teacher: Fertile.

Child: Yes.

Teacher: I'm going to tell you. I wanted you to think this out. One reason was because of the climate. Things grew the year round. The winters were not severe and there was always plenty of food.

(Hughes, 1959, pp. 105-106)

This is a rather haphazard course of learning, for any child. The rules that govern meaning are opaque. To the extent that children have difficulty mastering these rules, communication is threatened, and the teacher's questioning must serve a more general strategy of holding the class together. The discussion above is skating on the brink of "the discipline" problem. Allow us to point to the deliberate pun.

The congruence of classroom controls

Each of the three basic features of schooling discussed to this point, the crowding of pupils, the compulsion of school attendance, and the expectation that teachers will foster literacy, entails a heavy exercise of control. Still we have recognized at each point that things could go more than one way.

Teachers could employ or repress pupils' social competencies, could share more or less control over the course of activity, and could exclude or include pupils in the explicit construction of knowledge. These possibilities together with the constraints in which they are couched, constitute

the core problem of control inherent to schooling. They are problematic even before we raise the question of how social class and caste affect schooling. Before turning to this quesiton, let us ask why the standard classroom, the set of the more restrictive of each of these alternatives, emerges as the most common solution to the problem of control. The most encompassing explanation combines social ecology and developmental psychology. Space only allows us to suggest the argument here.

Recall that we have connected the three basic conditions of schooling to the social, the physical, and the intellectual aspects of the teaching-learning environment. The connections might have been drawn in other ways. For example, Foshay (1974) adds to these three domains another three, the emotional, the aesthetic, and the spiritual realms of the curriculum and the learning environment. In our view, these are variations on the social, the physical, and the intellectual, emphasizing the affective aspects of judgments of the good, the beautiful, and the true. The idea we have attempted to set up is that the social, physical, and intellectual domains of environments, not just in schools but more generally, tend to be congruent with one another. Intuitively, this idea is conveyed by the image of the standard classroom quoted from Goodlad and Klein on page 3 above. Operationally, it is best understood in terms of human judgments: an individual tends to orient consistently to one or another authority for all three kinds of judgments to be made in a given environment, intellectual, social, and physical, or matters of the true, the good, and the beautiful (pleasing or tolerable to the senses, etc.). Thus if a teacher sees him or herself as the ultimate arbiter of what is true in the knowledge realm of the classroom, the teacher is likely also to assume the role of ultimate authority for social and physical questions as well. If a child

perceives the teacher as the authority or not the authority, in one of these realms, the child equally tends to see the teacher this way in the other realms. Varying the psychologic of this now, let us say that for the teacher to accept the child as the authority, or as an authority to be negotiated with, in any of these realms--again, matters of the true, the good, and the beautiful--the teacher must accept the child as an arbiter in the remaining realms. Relating this to Fuller's theory of teachers' development, if a teacher has, perhaps in education courses, been persuaded of the validity of the child's own intellectual construction of reality, the teacher cannot act effectively on this without corresponding views of the meaning of the child's social and physical activity (Cf. Harvey, Prather, White, and Alter, 1966). The fact that teachers are probably not conscious of these distinctions, and children certainly not so, in the everyday running course of classroom events, does not contradict, but rather adds weight to our basic supposition. In short, an individual tends to look to some source in an environment, be it self or other, to determine what's "right" in all matters.

Environments influence individuals' judgments through both their pragmatic and their symbolic properties. Individual desks facilitate certain behaviors and impede others. They also signify that certain behaviors are expected and others not expected. Each of the three basic conditions of schooling conveys first--initially and most emphatically--the message that the teacher is supposed to be in control. The herding of children into social situations to which their rules do not apply, the external regulation of their energies, the conventions of knowledge to which they must submit, all signal that the teacher is to exercise control. Pragmatically and symbolically, these conditions reinforce one another (Finn, 1972). To be changed significantly, a classroom or school must be impacted

physically, socially, and intellectually (Sarason, 1971).

Differences between classrooms

The differences in classroom culture that appear to be associated with differences among children are best understood as variations on the standard classroom. A gradual accumulation of studies, especially in the ethnographic mode, is filling in details of these variations.

Metz (1978) observed classrooms in the upper and lower tracks of three junior high schools in a city where it was the policy that a given teacher be assigned to classes at both levels. The academic separation of the children was based on prior school achievement, which probably contributed to the fact that it was strongly associated with social class and ethnic separation--since previous school experience, not just ability, is reflected in achievement. The upper track students expected school to influence their growth and to be treated as "junior partners", i.e., to have their opinions taken seriously. The lower track students did not see any justification for performing the tasks of school, except that, as in Herndon's classes, that was "the way it spozed to be", and they did not have the upper track students' sense of proprietorship in the school. Metz writes,

> For teachers one of the most important aspects of students' behavior is the challenges which all classes make as they get to know a teacher and attempt to establish patterns to their own liking in areas of disagreement. Teachers in Canton were systematically questioned about these challenges, and all agreed that they were a fundamental fact of classroom interaction.
>
> Most agreed that students in Tracks Three and Four posed theirs primarily through overt physical or verbal disorder, while those in Track One and Honors Classes most often test the teacher's mastery of the subject and related intellectual matters. (Metz, 1978, pp. 4-5)

When the children engaged in explicitly prescribed behavior in class, it was more boisterous, expressive, and public in the lower tracks

and more private or "sneaky" in the upper tracks. (See also Schwartz, 1976) Teachers, in turn, responded with different management and disciplinary techniques in the upper and lower tracks. The latter children were assigned more to independent routine written tasks, which cut down on the opportunity for collective interference. Metz speculates that this was also more comfortable for the children themselves, as they were less exposed to public failure in independent work. The upper track students were engaged in more class discussion. Teachers less often felt they had to countervene behavior in the upper track classes, and when they did, an academic strategem, for example a question aimed at a napping child, usually sufficed to restore the expected order. In the lower track classes, teacher attempts to quell student misbehavior were harsher, more protracted, and further removed from the substance of the academic task concerned.

Metz's study strongly suggests an interpretation for the Goodlad and Klein finding that, already in the primary grades, disadvantaged children were assigned more to seatwork. One could ask, however, if this is not a constructive adaptation to the children's needs or learning styles. On the basis of still other studies, we would argue that in most cases it is not. The kind of "independent" activity that is involved here is typically associated with low percentages of time engaged in the presumed task. Grannis (1978), in ecological observations of second grade classrooms recommended as exemplars of several different models in Project Follow Through (the primary grade sequel to Head Start), found that, across the models, children tended to be "on task" only 64 percent of the time that they spent in those self-paced arithmetic and language arts activities which they had had no part in selecting, and the materials of which contained no explicit feedback to confirm the correctness of the children's

operations (an answer card, answers in the margin, manipulative materials, etc.). Time on task dropped to 61 percent if one considered just those situations where, in addition, the children were discouraged from interacting with one another. In other words, the children interacted anyway, and the task materials, furniture arrangements, and teacher "desists" (cf. Kounin, 1970) conveyed mainly the message that interaction was not relevant to the task! Conversely, the same children--"disadvantaged", of course--were progressively more on task as they gained more control over self-paced activity, i.e., as they could interact, were provided with materials that contained feedback, and had at least some choice of the specific task they pursued. However, these more consistently learner controlled conditions were relatively scarce in the self-paced arithmetic and language arts activities, i.e. the seatwork, of most of these classrooms. A variety of other studies (e.g., McDonald, 1976) suggest that inconsistent, let us say "low support", conditions predominate in classroom seatwork generally, with correspondingly low percentages of task engagement. Finally, there is mounting evidence that time engaged in academic tasks is associated with achievement in those tasks (e.g. Fisher, Filby, Marliave, Cahen, Dishaw, Moore, and Berliner, 1978). Thus low task engagement predicts low achievement, to which we must add that it is likely to generate, if indeed it does not represent, alienation.

Further aspects of recitation or discussion in classes with economically or ethnically minority children are important to note. A pattern reported in a variety of studies involves the teacher's asking more concrete questions of lower-income than of higher-income children. Leacock (1969) observed this in arithmetic, reading, and social studies instruction in contrasting inner-city elementary school classrooms. Leacock

stresses the consequences of the pattern, the perpetuation of the categories of thought that control relationships in society and between society and nature. (See also Keddie, 1971) Smith and Geoffrey show how Geoffrey shifted his level of questioning in a social studies lesson from more abstract to more concrete in order to obtain what he recognized as correct answers from his students (Smith and Geoffrey, 1968, p. 179). Without our denying the socializing effect, this latter explanation, closer to the classroom, appears to be very important to attend to. (See Turner, 1974, on the question of teleological explanation here.) It is intriguing in this connection that Goodlad and Klein found that most of the children's answers to the questions they observed teachers asking in primary grade classrooms were correct. Perhaps one could amend this to say the answers were accepted by the teachers, including in this way the device by which a teacher "accepts" an unwanted or divergent answer in the process of dismissing it, as in the California Indians discussion quoted above. Obtaining correct answers seems to be central to the use of recitation to manage a class, as much as to develop knowledge and understanding in their own right. Where children have less access to the knowledge in question ahead of time, or from their experience, the first tactic appears to be to obtain the answers from other children in the class, the second tactic to lower the level of the questioning, and the third to dissolve the discussion in favor of seatwork.

A number of sociolinguistic studies, especially Boggs (1972), Philips (1972), and Lein (1975), have called attention to the contrast between the individually oriented interactive style of the standard classroom, and the collectively oriented interactions of minority children in their own subcultural settings. The children in the above mentioned studies, native

Hawaiian, American Indian, and migrant American Black, were found to be loathe to compete against one another in the presence of an adult authority, specifically in the language game of the standard classroom. Knowing that it is a few children who dominate the discussion in most classrooms one might relate this observation to the collectivization of subordinate children in classrooms generally. Roberts (1970) analyzed various manifestations of the problem of control in urban junior high school classrooms. Teachers tended to conduct question-and-answer sessions or individualized work, in neither case utilizing and developing the students' relationships to one another. Even the relatively rare "group work" observed was used as a device for funneling correct answers to a teacher, or for pitting one group against another. Roberts interpreted the students' responses as group reactions nonetheless:

> Structurally, apathetic groups are fragmented assortments of persons united in one purpose: If we can't be trusted to relate to each other, we will not relate to the teacher. In contrast to the silence of this covert rejection, the overt reaction against authority produces a structure consisting of strong subgroups, each with one aim: Destroy authority and nullify the structure of one-to-one interaction with the teacher. (Roberts, 1970, p. 84)

It is interesting to examine in the light of the above discussion the Oregon (Direct Instruction) program of Bereiter, Engelmann, and Becker, which has produced the strongest academic achievement test gains of the various programs in Project Follow Through (Kennedy, 1978). The program infuses the traditional classroom recitation and seatwork settings with behavior modification practices. The seatwork assignments are called "take homes", signifying that they will be taken home <u>after</u> they have been completed correctly--a switch on "homework" that is often the occasion for failure at home. The take homes are programmed. On a given day they can generally be done in whatever order each child determines,

in between recitation periods. Otherwise, the take home setting resembles the conventional seatwork setting. The recitations, too, are programmed to produce high rates of correct responses to concept and skill patterned, but still single answer, questions. The recitations involve mass choral chanting. Children also recite individually on command, but there is no hand waving to be selected by the teacher. The behavior of the teacher is prescribed as closely as that of the pupils.

The fact that three quarters of the day in these classrooms is allocated to language arts and arithmetic, coupled with the fact that much of this time is spent in the relatively on-task recitation settings, is the simplest explanation for the achievement results of the Oregon program. Apart from the achievement question, the somewhat higher support conditions in the seatwork setting, and the positive cast of the recitations, especially the collective responding, appear to reduce the disorder and alienation commonly found in classrooms with minority children. On the other hand, the Oregon program's exclusively standard English orientation rejects the language of the children's cultures (Hill, 1977) and its total programming allows for no differentiation among the children, except in the rate at which different groups in the classroom progress.

It is probably no accident that the highest achieving program in Follow Through most closely resembles, and builds upon, the traditional classroom (cf. Stallings, 1974). Intriguingly, the teachers whom Stallings (op. cit.) had observed implementing the Oregon program most in accordance with the model expressed the most dissatisfaction with it! One might speculate that the model had enabled them to increase control of their classes and thus to resolve the major concerns of Fuller's initial teaching phase, and that the teachers then were ready to change toward a more differentiated, child oriented classroom.

An example of the latter can be understood as a further variant, let us say an outgrowth, of the standard classroom. Marshall (1972) reports his struggle to establish a nonauthoritarian discipline in a sixth grade classroom in an inner-city, low-income Black community. During a first, turbulent year the classroom yawed back and forth between teacher control from the front of the room and peer control from the back. Slowly, in a second and third year with new students, a learning stations approach evolved, shaped almost as much by the students as by the teacher. Marshall summarizes the major differences of the system from the conventional classroom as follows:

1. Kids sit in groups spread around the room rather than in rows.

2. Worksheets in seven subject areas (Math, English, Social Studies, Spelling, Creative Writing, General, and Reading) are put in pockets scattered around the outside of the room every morning Monday through Thursday.

3. On these station days, the students are free to move around the room and do the worksheets in any order they like as long as they finish all seven by the end of the day.

4. The teacher's role is not one of controlling the class or teaching seven subjects (or even one) at the front of the room, but rather: (a) writing worksheets for seven subjects the night before and running off copies first thing in the morning; (b) moving around the room during the station time helping people with the work and any other problems; (c) planning other activities for the remaining part of the day after the stations are finished; (d) correcting the stations with the whole class in the last hour of the day; and (e) evaluating progress in the traditional subjects with tests every Friday.

Marshall's documentation--students' writing, sample worksheets, and photographs of the classroom--show a high level of adaptation between teacher and students, for example in the accomodation of concept and skill instruction to students' concerns (the reason for writing the worksheets the night before they were to be used). Marshall systematically linked everyday events to more general categories of thought. His students started out behaving no less obstreperously than Herndon's, but in the

end their intelligence and sociability were directed more toward educational goals.

Open classrooms represent a still greater departure from the conventional classroom, particularly in the wider range of options for activity they generally give, their greater use of manipulative materials, and, more or less following from these conditions, the lesser time they allocate to academic instruction (Grannis, 1978). As open classrooms tend to be concentrated in the primary grades, a comparison to Marshall's classroom might be inappropriate. Theoretically, however, open classrooms are an alternative at any grade level. What is important to notice here is, first, that they optimize the possibility of the pupils', especially younger children's, regulating their interactions through concrete activities. Ross, Zimiles, and Gerstein (1976) observed much higher frequencies of interaction, especially initiated by children, in nine open classrooms than in four traditional classrooms, all of which classrooms were in public schools in lower-income inner-city neighborhoods. Similar findings obtained for two "developmental" (Bank Street) and two traditional classrooms in middle-income schools.

> ...when the content of the interactions is more closely analyzed, important qualitative differences among the four groups are seen. In the classrooms of the traditional groups, for example, a much larger proportion of all Gives Information interactions was concerned with rote and routine behaviors compared to classrooms of the nontraditional groups. In both nontraditional groups, too, most of the cognitive statements were distributed among subcategories representing higher-level behaviors. The proportion of questioning behavior that dealt with routine inquiries was highest in the Traditional Lower group and lowest in the Developmental Middle group. The traditional groups' expressive interactions more often involved expressions of need (social, physical, and task-related), whereas the nontraditional groups had a greater proportion of expression of preferences, of feelings and attitudes, and of concern for others. The largest differences in subcategory patterns occurred in relation to the category concerned with representational and symbolic behavior. Virtually all of the interactions of the two traditional groups involved reading-drill activities, while the bulk of these behaviors in the Developmental Middle group and a sizable proportion of those of the Open Lower group included forms of dramatic and creative

> expression and a much wider variety of experience involving symbolization. (Ross, Zimiles, and Gerstein, 1976, pp. 47-48)

From a questionnaire survey of children in two parochial middle schools in lower-income neighborhoods, one an open and one a traditional school, Franks, Wismer, and Dillon (1974) found that the open school children judged each other as good or bad students more on the basis of factors related to peer interaction, whereas traditional school children emphasized conformity to teacher authority and de-emphasized attributes important to peer endeavors. It was also found that the labeling process was relatively rigid in the traditional school, the labels good and bad being distributed among a smaller proportion of children than in the open school.

Our discussion of the culture of classrooms with minority students has led us into discussing alternatives to the standard classroom, in part to demonstrate that the way is is supposed to be is not the way it has to be. However, it could be fateful to ignore students', and their parents', ideas of what school is supposed to be. Barth (1972) has chronicled the failure of a rush into open education in one inner-city elementary school. Marshall took great care to arrive at a classroom system that was meaningful to his students and their parents. Bernstein (1977) particularly has raised the question of whether the more "visible" pedagogy of the traditional classroom might not have more currency for lower-income children than the relatively "invisible" pedagogy of the open classroom--though Bernstein's analysis is oriented to British society and cannot easily be translated into American terms.

Much of what we have written here about, in effect, the classroom's stereotyping behavior patterns for majority and minority students, applies to the roles of boys and girls in classrooms. Lee and Kedar (1974) have specifically argued that teachers favor docile behavior in their attempts to cope with the crowding of children in the classroom, and that this re-

sults in more positive sanctions for girls', and more negative for boys', traditional sex roles. Lightfoot (1976) has called further attention to the double jeopardy of young black girls, who may learn a more agressive coping style outside of school, and thus do not conform to the norm of girls from the majority culture.

From Goodlad and Klein's study, summarized at the outset of our chapter, it would be surmised that alternatives to the standard classroom are very scarce, at least by behavioral standards. We have argued, indeed, that there are reasons to expect them to continue to be scarce. Epstein and McPartland (1977, 1978), however, from a questionnaire survey of 7361 students in the elementary and secondary schools of a county public school system, did find substantial variation between schools on a measure of what they called "formal school structural properties of openness:" individualization of instruction, control of student conversation and movement, control of student assignments, and frequency of supervision of student assignments. These properties were only slightly associated with the open plan architecture of some of the schools, but might be attributed to the extensive developmental efforts of the school system in question. The schools did not differ significantly on what Epstein and McPartland call "informal openness", including whether teachers expected originality and personal opinions in students' classwork, as opposed to close conformity to their own directions and ideas, and whether teachers reserved most of the decision-making prerogatives for themselves or extended decision-making opportunities informally to students. Still, while there was not <u>between</u> school variation on informal openness, there was <u>within</u> school variation on this measure. Furthermore, the informal properties

were strongly associated with nonacademic student outcomes such as self-reliance and attitudes toward school, while the formal properties were found to have only a small effect on these outcomes. (Academic achievement was not affected by either set of properties.) The socio-economic status of the students was controlled for in these analyses.

Reasoning from the lack of differences in informal openness between the open and traditional schools, Epstein and McPartland suggest that teacher personality might have contributed to the within-school differences in informal openness. This would bring us back to Fuller's idea of teachers' developmental stages, and our realization of the fundamental constraints on teachers' yielding control over classroom events.

A recent study by Moos (1978) differentiates secondary school classrooms more broadly than the Epstein and McPartland study, and might be taken as a "state of the art" example of the measurement of classroom climate. Moos administered the Classroom Environment Scale (CES) to students in 200 classrooms from 36 schools, including public general high schools, vocational, private, and alternative high schools, and junior high schools, located in a variety of communities on the East and West coasts of the United States. The CES consists of 90 true-false items which fall into nine different sub-scales, each of which measures students' perceptions of the emphasis on one dimension of classroom climate. Analysis of the students' responses yielded five distinct clusters of classrooms: control oriented (47 classrooms), change oriented (44 classrooms), affiliation oriented (26 classrooms), task oriented (47 classrooms), and competition oriented (32 classrooms). Four classrooms could not be located in any cluster. One of the interesting details of these patterns

is that within two of the clusters, affiliation oriented and task oriented, there were two subclusters, one with an above average, and the other with a below average, emphasis on teacher control; while within the competition oriented cluster, there were three subclusters, one having an above average, another an average, and the third a below average, emphasis on teacher control. Thus variations on control continue to be central in Moos' more fine-grained analysis. The competition oriented subcluster with average teacher control was further distinguished from the other two competition subclusters in having a greater than average emphasis on "teacher support" or personal-affective teacher-student relationships. Moos labels this a "supportive" competition-oriented type, as opposed to the "structurer" and "unstructured" competition-oriented types of the other two of these subclusters.

Moos also administered a questionnaire asking the students how satisfied they were with their school, their class, the other students in the class, their teacher, and their learning in the class. Analyses of variance were conducted to ascertain the extent to which these five student satisfaction variables discriminated among both the five clusters and the nine subclusters. Satisfaction with school did not significantly differentiate in either analysis. However, each of the other satisfaction variables significantly differentiated among class types in both sets of analyses. We notice the parallel to Epstein and McPartland's findings. More spevifically on what amount to the within-school differences,

> Students in control oriented classes were the least satisfied with the class, the teacher, and the amount of material they were learning. A similar pattern of results occurred in the structured task oriented classes and, to a somewhat lesser extent, in the unstructured competition oriented and affiliation oriented classes. Students were relatively

> highly satisfied with the class and the teacher in innovation oriented and supportive competition oriented classes. Surprisingly, students in task oriented classrooms felt they were not learning much actual material; however, the class milieu may have led to higher expectations about the amount they should be learning. Finally, students liked each other more in classes which emphasized student-student affiliation. (Moos, 1978, p.60)

Moos' discussion of these findings emphasizes the discovery of 47 classrooms "almost exclusively oriented toward teacher control of student behavior", and the finding that students--and teachers-- were in general "more satisfied with innovation oriented than with control oriented classes."

Further,

> The relative degree of structure and support was very important in moderating student and teacher satisfaction in the other three types of classes. The results suggest that structure is basically positively related to student and teacher satisfaction, unless that structure is rigidly imposed on students in a non-supportive context. A moderate degree of structure (particularly clarity of expectations) in a class oriented toward student-student interaction and/or teacher support relates positively to student involvement and satisfaction and, to a somewhat lesser extent, teacher satisfaction as well. These results highlight the negative implications of classroom disruption and lack of teacher preparedness, as well as the importance of structure around rules and the predictability of the environment. A classroom that is "out of control" is not a pleasant experience for either teachers or students.
>
> The evidence from the task oriented classrooms indicates that the degree of classroom structure can become too rigid and non-supportive. In these classes, students and teachers were generally more satisfied with the unstructured than the structured subtypes. This is not related to teacher control per se, since the emphasis in this area was slightly higher in the structured competition oriented than in the structured task oriented classes. The difference is in the overall context in which the control occurs. The structural competition oriented classes placed more emphasis on student affiliation, teacher support and innovation than the structured task oriented classes. Thus, the same "objective" level of teacher control may be perceived as more restrictive and rigid in settings which lack emphasis on the relationship dimensions. Conversely, an emphasis on organization and structure may be perceived positively in settings which are also moderately warm and supportive. (Ibid., p. 63-64)

We began this chapter with the observation that classrooms everywhere are "different" and the "same". Our analysis attended first to the sameness of classrooms, but in these last pages it has recognized more the differences between classrooms. How can classrooms be both same and different We suggest that this is largely a matter of point of view. When classrooms are compared with other settings, including the alternative educational settings that are the reference points for the Goodlad and Klein and the Martin Report judgments, they appear to be more same than different. When classrooms are compared against themselves, the judgments implicitly accept the constraints of the classroom situation, and differences stemming more from the students' and the teachers' styles become more prominent. Moos in his use of the term "relative" to characterize different levels of student satisfaction, and his discussion of the importance of structure in the classroom, recognizes the boundaries of the classroom situation.

The finding of differences does not diminish the need to explore alternatives to the classroom. Our analysis of the classroom situation has made us more aware of how far-reaching alternatives to the classroom might have to be in order to develop fundamentally different educational possibilities. It may be that the most significant changes in classrooms would only be possible if the basic conditions of schooling--again we mean the pupil teacher ratio, the fixed time frame, and academic testing--were so altered that the standard classroom simply would not work. This is a different way of rendering the conclusions reached by Goodlad and Klein and the Martin Report. One wonders what effect a new understanding of these things will have upon education.

REFERENCES

Barth, Roland S. Open Education and the American School. New York: Shocken, 1972.

Bernstein, Basil. Class, codes and control, Volume III: Towards a theory of educational transmissions. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, revised edition, 1977.

Blum, Alan F. The corpus of knowledge as a normative order. In Michael F.D. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and Control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Brownell, William A. and Gordon Hendrickson. How children learn information concepts, and generalizations. 49th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Coleman, James S. The adolescent society. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1961.

Cusick, Philip A. Inside high school. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Epstein, Joyce L. and James M. McPartland. Family and school interactions and main effects on affective outcomes. Report 235. Baltimore: The Johns HopkinsUniversity Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1977.

Epstein, Joyce L. and James M. McPartland. Authority structures and student development. Report 246. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1978.

Finn, Jeremy D. Expectations and the educational environment. Review of Educational Research, 1972, 42, 387-410.

Fisher, Charles W., Nikola N. Filby, Richard S. Marliave, Leonard S. Cahen, M. Dishaw, J.E. Moore, and David C. Berliner. Final Report of the beginning teacher evaluation study. Technical Report V-1. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development, June, 1978.

Foshay, Arthur W. Toward a humane curriculum. In Arthur W. Foshay, Essays on curriculum. New York: Curriculum and Teaching Department, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1975.

Franks, David D., Susan L. Wismer, and Stephen V. Dillon. Peer labeling in open and traditional schools. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1974.

Fuller, Frances F. Concerns of teachers: A development conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Goodlad, John I. and M. Frances Klein. Behind the classroom door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

Goody, J. and I. Watt. The consequences of literacy. Comparative Studies in History and Sociology, v (3), 1962.

Grannis, Joseph C. Task engagement and the distribution of pedagogical controls: An ecological study of differently structured classroom settings. Curriculum Inquiry, 1978, 8, pp. 3-36.

Gronlund, Norman E. Sociometry in the Classroom. New York Harper and Row, 1959.

Harvey, O.J.,Misha S. Prather, B. Jack White, and Richard D. Alter. Teachers' belief systems and preschool atmospheres. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57, 373-381.

Henry, Jules. Culture against man. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Herndon, James. The way it spozed to be. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.

Hill, Clifford A. A review of the language deficit position: Some socio-linguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives. IRCD Bulletin, Fall 1977, 12, 1-13.

Holt, John. How children fail. New York: Pitman, 1964.

Hughes, Marie M. and associates. A research report: The assessment of the quality of teaching. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1959.

Jackson, Philip W. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Kennedy, Mary M. Findings from the Follow Through planned variation study. Educational Researcher, 1978, 7, 3-11.

Kounin, Jacob S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Leacock, Eleanor B. Teaching and learning in city schools. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Lee, Patrick C. and Gita Kedar. Sex role and pupil role in early childhood education. Resources in Education, 10, (January-June 1975), 493.

Lein, Laura, You were talkin' though, oh yes, you was: Black migrant children, their speech at home and school. Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1975, 6, 1-11.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence, Socialization and education of young black girls in school. Teachers College Record, 1976, 78, 239-262.

Lortie, Dan C. School-teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McDonald, Frederick J. Beginning teacher evaluation study, phase II, 1973-74: Executive summary report. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

McPherson, Gertrude H. Small town teacher. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Marshall, Kim. Law and order in grade 6-E. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1972.

Martin, John H. (Chairman). Report of the National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1975.

Metz, Mary Haywood. Teachers' adjustments to students' behavior: Some implications for the process of desegregation. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

Moos, Rudolf H. A typology of junior high and high school classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15, 53-66.

Philips, Susan U. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes (Eds.) Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College, 1972.

Piaget, Jean. Science of education and the psychology of the child. New York: Orion Press, 1970.

Roberts, Joan I. Scene of the battle: Group behavior in the classroom. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Ross, Sylvia, Herbert Zimiles, and David Gerstein. Children's interactions in traditional and nontraditional classrooms. Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota, 1976.

Sarason, Seymour B. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Schwartz, Frances. Continuity and change in student adaptation to one alternative school: The transformation of academic behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1976.

Smith, Louis M. and William Geoffrey. The complexities of an urban classroom. New York: Holt , Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Stallings, Jane. An implementation study of seven Follow Through models for education. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, 1974.

Stinchcombe, Arthur. Rebellion in a high school. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1969.

Waller, Willard. The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley, 1932.

Young, Michael F.D. Knowledge and control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.